



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,765	11/03/2003	John Gandy	20509.023	4233

42922 7590 06/24/2005

WHITAKER, CHALK, SWINDLE & SAWYER, LLP
3500 CITY CENTER TOWER II
301 COMMERCE STREET
FORT WORTH, TX 76102-4186

EXAMINER

KOEHLER, ROBERT R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1775

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,765

Applicant(s)

GANDY, JOHN

Examiner

Robert R. Koehler

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on February 17, 2004 (Prel. Amdt.).
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17, 18 and 20-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 July 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

RRK.
6-22-05

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11032003
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

The drawings were received on July 29, 2004. These drawings are not acceptable.

1. The drawings are objected to because longitudinal roller set **20** is not shown in Figure 2. See lines 9 to 11 on page 15 of the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Element **19** in Figure 2 is not mentioned in the specification. See lines 9 to 15 on page 15 of the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the

Art Unit: 1775

immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to because Figure 4 contains an incorrect spelling of "austenite." The word "austerite" should be changed to "austenite." Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

1. Applicant is advised that should claim 15 be found allowable, claim 19 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing,

Art Unit: 1775

despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

2. Applicant is advised that should claim 17 be found allowable, claim 20 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 4 to 14, 17, 18, and 20 to 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,820,703 (Suzuki, et al.).

Suzuki, et al. discloses a production method of a low carbon martensitic stainless steel pipe for use in the petroleum, natural gas, and petrochemical industries. The martensitic stainless steel pipe disclosed by Suzuki, et al. contains the same alloying elements as claimed by the applicant with alloy elemental ranges that overlap applicant's claimed alloy elemental range limits. Note the alloy elemental ranges for chromium and carbon. Prior art which teaches a range within, overlapping, or touching the claimed range anticipates if the prior art range discloses the claimed range with sufficient specificity. See MPEP 2131.03 and *Ex parte Lee*, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). The production of stainless steel pipe includes the steps of forming a steel coil which substantially comprises a martensitic metal structure, cutting the hot coil into a predetermined width, shaping continuously both of the steel edges into a

Art Unit: 1775

cylindrical shape, and creating a seam at the steel edges by electric resistance welding to produce a seam-welded steel pipe. See line 19 in column 2 to line 36 in column 3. The seam-welded portion of the stainless steel pipe is reheated in order to reduce non-uniformity occurring at the time of seam welding and to improve the toughness of the seam-welded portion. See line 20 in column 7 to line 39 in column 8.

2. Claims 1 to 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,379,821 B2 (Kushida, et al.).

Kushida, et al. discloses a stainless steel pipe having a full martensitic metal structure or a mixed martensitic phase and a ferritic phase for usage in the petroleum or natural gas industries. The primarily martensitic stainless steel pipe can have a large diameter and be welded by using the SAW method. See lines 11 to 18 in column 1 and lines 25 to 60 in column 14. Although the applicant claims a stainless steel pipe having a seam region that is welded by an electric resistance welding technique, the stainless steel pipe as disclosed by Kushida, et al. would be expected to have the same seam-welded region along its length. The stainless steel pipe containing a martensitic phase and a ferritic phase as disclosed by Kushida, et al. contains the same alloying elements as claimed by the applicant with alloy elemental ranges that overlap applicant's claimed alloy elemental range limits. Note the alloy elemental ranges for chromium and carbon. See line 37 in column 7 to line 5 in column 8 and line 53 in column 8 to line 47 in column 9. Prior art which teaches a range within, overlapping, or touching the claimed range anticipates if the prior art range discloses the claimed range with sufficient specificity. See MPEP 2131.03 and *Ex parte Lee*, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15, 16, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1775

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art does not teach or reasonably suggest a method of manufacturing a welded stainless steel pipe by using a high frequency induction welding technique wherein the stainless steel pipe is a low carbon dual phase (ferrite plus martensite) stainless steel.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Robert Koehler whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1536**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones, can be reached on **(571) 272-1535**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).


ROBERT R. KOEHLER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1775
June 22, 2005